



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,778	09/11/2000	Ghassan Semaan	453.02	4433

2292 7590 10/21/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

ELALLAM, AHMED

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2662

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/658,778

Applicant(s)

SEMAAN, GHASSAN

Examiner

AHMED ELALLAM

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This communication is responsive to amendment filed on July 24, 2003. The amendment has been entered.

Claims 1-17 are pending.

#### ***Specification***

1. The amendment filed on July 24, 2003 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "and another is the Synchronous Digital Hierarchy (SDH) Standard used in Europe that has many similarities and is generally equivalent to SONET".

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action, including claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had

Art Unit: 2662

possession of the claimed invention. The amendment limitation of "SONET" to SONET/SDH is ground for new matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen et al, US (6,501,758).

Regarding claim 1, Chen discloses a fiber ring (SONET ring) system in which a STS level signals, or combinations of STS level signals are used, the system facilitates effective and efficient communication of ATM and TDM traffic over the common fiber ring. The system, through a variety of configurations and modes of operation, provides flexibility in the distribution of bandwidth between ATM and TDM traffic. Column 4, lines

Art Unit: 2662

43-62, Column 6, lines 66-67 and column 7, lines 1-14. (Corresponding to claimed subdividing a portion of data frames comprising a SONET layer into two or more logical channels, each logical channel having associated therewith a predetermined bandwidth capacity). Chen further discloses that virtual path automatic protection switching (VP APS) is used for STS/ATM traffic, and uni-directional path-switched ring protection is offered to STS/TDM traffic. And adjustment of the bandwidth allotted to either traffic type is accomplished provisioning the STS paths accordingly. See column 8, lines 24-39. (Corresponding to assigning a protection mechanism to each logical channel). Chen further discloses an automatic protection switching selector within a node in the fiber ring that chooses incoming signals from either working or protection channels depending on the configuration of the circuit and whether a fault has been detected. In a particular mode of operation, where ring 12 is configured as a bi-directional line-switched ring, automatic protection switching selector identify predetermined ATM - carrying channels and disables line switching protection for these pre-designated ATM - carrying channels. Column 12, lines 8-21. (Corresponding to monitoring the SONET ring transmission to determine protection mechanisms associated with each logical channel).

Regarding claim 2, Chen discloses STS level signals, or combinations of STS level signals are used, See column 4, lines 43-62, column 6, lines 66-67 and column 7, lines 1-14. (Corresponding to data frames comprise a plurality of STS level one frame).

Regarding claim 3, Chen discloses that virtual path automatic protection switching (VP APS) is used for STS/ATM traffic, and uni-directional path-switched ring

Art Unit: 2662

protection is offered to STS/TDM traffic. See column 8, lines 24-39. (Corresponding to the protection mechanism comprise one of a layer1 SONET protection mechanism and a layer 2 protection mechanism).

Regarding claim 4, with reference to Figure 1, Chen discloses that System 10 facilitates effective and efficient communication of ATM and TDM traffic over a common fiber ring. Through a variety of configurations and modes of operation, system 10 provides flexibility in the distribution of bandwidth between ATM and TDM traffic. For example, if one type of traffic dominates the ring, system 10 can be configured to focus the majority of its resources on communicating that type of traffic. In addition, by providing ATM layer processing functionality at least some of nodes 14 on fiber ring 12, system 10 facilitates a high granularity in switching ATM information carried in STM signals. Column 2, lines 37-58. (Corresponding to limitation of claim 4).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Chen discloses that Fiber ring 12 may comprise, for example, a two-fiber ring configured in a uni-directional path-switched ring (UPSR ) mode, or a bi-directional path-switched ring (BLSR ) mode.

Regarding claim 7, with reference to Figure 1, Chen discloses that System 10 facilitates effective and efficient communication of ATM and TDM traffic over a common fiber ring. Through a variety of configurations and modes of operation, system 10 provides flexibility in the distribution of bandwidth between ATM and TDM traffic. For example, if one type of traffic dominates the ring, system 10 can be configured to focus the majority of its resources on communicating that type of traffic. In addition, by providing ATM layer processing functionality at least some of nodes 14

Art Unit: 2662

on fiber ring 12, system 10 facilitates a high granularity in switching ATM information carried in STM signals. Column 2, lines 37-58. (Corresponding to Layer2 protection mechanism comprises at least one of: an Ethernet protection mechanism, an Asynchronous transport mode protection mechanism, or a time division multiplexing protection mechanism).

Regarding claims 8-14, claims 8-14 are apparatus claims and have substantially the same scope of respective method claims 1-7, thus they are subject to the same rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Bisson et al, US (6,349,092).

Regarding claim 15, Chen discloses that VT (Virtual tributary) traffic is carried within the transport Signals (data frame).see column 3, lines 1-24. but it does not explicitly disclose that the VT is VT-1.5.

However, Bisson discloses that SONET defines synchronous signals known as virtual tributaries (VTs) to transport lower speed signals and that VTs operate at four levels below STS-1. The four defined sizes of VTs are VT-1.5 (1.728 Mbps) for DS1

Art Unit: 2662

signals, VT-2 (2.304 Mbps) for CEPT-1 signals, VT-3 (3.456 Mbps) for DS1C signals, and VT-6 (6.912 Mbps) for DS2 signals. Within an STS-1 frame, each VT occupies a portion of the frame. Within the STS-1, different VT groups can be mixed together to form one STS-1 payload. See column 5, lines 3-11.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have the VT frames of Chen comprise VT 1.5 level frames so that lower speed signal can be provided.

Claim 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen.

Regarding claims 16 and 17, Chen discloses STS level signals, or combinations of STS level signals are used, See column 4, lines 43-62, column 6, lines 66-67 and column 7, lines 1-14.

Chen does not explicitly disclose that the STS-1 frame are non-contiguous.

However, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have the STS-1 frames of Chen being non-contiguous or contiguous as a design choice.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. The objections raised in the first action with reference to drawings, specification are withdrawn.

The rejection 112 2<sup>nd</sup> with reference to claims 4 and 11 has been withdrawn.



Art Unit: 2662

Applicant's arguments filed July 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**102 rejection:**

Applicant argues that Chen does not teach or suggest the feature of "subdividing a portion of the data frame comprising a SONET/SDH layer into two or more logical channel" as recited in independent claims 1 and 8. Examiner respectfully disagree, the newly added limitation of SDH is not given weight in this argument, Chen discloses a fiber ring (SONET ring) system in which a STS level signals, or combinations of STS level signals are used, the system facilitates effective and efficient communication of ATM and TDM traffic over the common fiber ring, the system through a variety of configurations and modes of operation, provides flexibility in the distribution of bandwidth between ATM and TDM traffic. Column 4, lines 43-62, Column 6, lines 66-67 and column 7, lines 1-14. Thus, given the broadest interpretation of claim limitations, Chen does disclose the feature of "subdividing a portion of the data frame comprising a SONET layer into two or more logical channel". The provisioning of distributed bandwidth between ATM and TDM traffic using STS SONET level frame does read on Applicant limitation.

Applicant also argue that Chen does not teach or suggest "monitoring the SONET transmission to determine protection mechanisms associated with each logical channel". Examiner disagree. Chen discloses that virtual path automatic protection switching (VP APS) is used for STS/ATM traffic, and uni-directional path-switched ring protection is offered to STS/TDM traffic (protection mechanism), and adjusting the

Art Unit: 2662

bandwidth allotted to either traffic type is accomplished provisioning the STS paths accordingly. See column 8, lines 24-39, Chen further discloses an automatic protection switching selector within a node in the fiber ring that chooses incoming signals from either working or protection channels depending on the configuration of the circuit and whether a fault has been detected. In a particular mode of operation, where ring 12 is configured as a bi-directional line-switched ring, automatic protection switching selector identify predetermined ATM -carrying channels and disables line switching protection for these pre-designated ATM -carrying channels. Column 12, lines 8-21. Thus, given the broadest interpretation of claim limitations, Chen does disclose the invention as claimed.

**103 rejection:** Applicant argues that Bisson is not and cannot be relied upon for establishing a prima facie case. Examiner disagree, given the rejection of claim 8 as being anticipated by Chen, it follow that the limitation of taught by Bisson of VT-1.5 which is a standard, can be implemented in any SONET environment.

Examiner concludes that the limitations of claim 1 and 8 of "logical channel" and protection mechanism are broad, and that Chen does indeed discloses Applicant's invention as claimed.

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2662

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AHMED ELALLAM whose telephone number is (703) 308-6069. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kizou Hassan can be reached on (703) 305-4744. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

A.ELALLAM  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2662  
October 6, 2003

  
HASSAN KIZOU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600